

members continue to have serious misgivings about the nomination.

Two weeks ago, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee considered Mr. Hoagland's nomination. During the hearing, Mr. Hoagland failed to adequately respond to the questions asked by the Senators, including not clarifying the U.S.'s policy in the denial of the Armenian genocide. In many instances, he did not respond to specific Senate inquiries. He diverted his answers by responding with what seemed like prepared talking points, and went to great lengths to avoid using the term genocide.

Additionally, in response to a written inquiry from Senator JOHN KERRY concerning Turkey's criminal prosecution of journalists for writing about the Armenian genocide, Mr. Hoagland referred to these writings as allegations.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. has historically taken a leadership role in preventing genocide and human rights violations, but the Bush administration continues to play word games by not calling evil by its proper name. Instead, they refer to the mass killings of 1.5 million Armenians as tragic events. This term cannot be substituted for genocide. The two words are simply not synonymous.

Mr. Speaker, there are historical documents that cannot be refuted, yet somehow the administration continues to ignore the truth in fear of offending another government.

The Bush administration has not offered a meaningful explanation of its reasons for firing the current U.S. Ambassador to Armenia, John Evans. In fact, the State Department's assertion that it did not receive any communications from the Turkish Government concerning Ambassador Evans' February 2005 affirmation of the Armenian genocide is simply not credible.

Official Department of Justice filings by the Turkish Government's registered foreign agent, the Livingston Group, document that there are at least four different occasions of communications with State Department officials following Ambassador Evans' remarks affirming the Armenian genocide. Still, the State Department refutes these claims.

Mr. Speaker, this lack of honesty has been an all too common practice of the Bush administration. The American people and this Congress deserve a full and truthful account of the role of the Turkish Government in denying the Armenian genocide. Our Nation's response to genocide should not be denigrated to a level acceptable to the Turkish Government. It is about time the Bush administration started dictating a policy for Americans and not for a foreign government.

Mr. Speaker, I fear that sending an ambassador to Yerevan who denies the Armenian genocide would represent a tragic escalation in the Bush administration's ignorance and support in Turkey's campaign of genocide denial. The State Department has reported to Sen-

ate offices that they expect Ambassador Designate Hoagland to be confirmed during a business meeting early next week. I would urge the Senate to block his nomination until this administration recognizes the Armenian genocide.

□ 1845

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOUSTANY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SHAYS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### DROUGHT RELIEF

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. OSBORNE. During the month of August, most Members of Congress will be in their districts, and the thing that those of us in the middle part of the country will see is what is reflected on this map which deals with the drought. We see some brown areas, some red areas. And what this represents is not just 1 year of drought, but rather, we are in the eighth year of a drought that has exceeded, in many cases, the drought of the 1930s, the Dust Bowl years.

Now, you don't see clouds of dust blowing around. You don't see dust 3 or 4 inches high on window sills because of conservation practices. We no longer plow up our fields like we once did. But the drought, in most cases in this area, is actually more extreme over a longer period of time than what we saw in the most extreme drought of the last century.

There are parts of Nebraska where we are now 40 inches short of moisture, and in many of these areas the total rain fall in an average year is only 15 inches, so over that period of 7 or 8 years, 40 inches of shortage is a tremendous hit to take.

To make matters even worse, we have had extremely high temperatures. Normally, in the Dakotas and Nebraska you might see one or two days in the 100-degree range, 102, 103. But this summer we have had numerous days between 110, 115 degrees of temperature. And of course, these are records. So the heat and the drought compounded has led to a disastrous situation.

Dry land crops are either totally wiped out at this point or barely hanging on. And probably the most immediate, most pressing problem deals with our pastures, because if you have livestock and you have no grass pasture, there is nothing you can do but sell off your livestock, and so that has been happening rather rapidly.

Reservoirs in this area are down by 50 to 75 percent. And so the irrigation water in these reservoirs is pretty much nonexistent.

One other thing that many times people will mention, they say, well, you have got crop insurance, so why won't that take care of you? Well, the problem is this, that each year that you have a drought and you have less production means that the next year you can purchase less crop insurance because of the loss that you had the year before. So after 7 or 8 successive years, the amount of crop insurance that you can purchase has been reduced by 50, 60 percent, so you don't even really get the amount of money back that your inputs, your seed and your fertilizer cost you in the first place. So, as a result, obviously we have a very difficult situation.

In 2002, we had a very similar, very disastrous drought, and we did get some drought relief. And the thing that happened at that point was those who showed loss, who absolutely needed the help, got some. And then in 2003, we found people, lawmakers from other States said, well, so and so is getting some help, so we need to get some help too. And pretty soon we were expanding drought relief to areas that had no drought, who had no crop loss. And as a result, the series of articles we have seen in The Washington Post are accurate. And it was certainly our fault, those of us in Congress, for letting this get out of hand.

And of course, this is going to make it even more difficult at this point to do anything about the current drought. But we are hoping that people will understand that it is possible to administer a drought relief program responsibly, to get the money to people who really are hurting, because we are probably going to lose some farmers and ranchers this year in great numbers. And we hope that we do get some help.

And sometimes people say, well, you have got to have an offset. And so we are starting to look for offsets. We are trying to look for someplace where we can get this drought relief money from. But the way the Federal budget is at the present time, it is very, very difficult to find an offset.

So we have seen disaster relief go to many areas of the country. We just want to make people aware of what is going on. And we hope that, as people come back from the August break, they will bear this in mind and possibly have some disaster relief.

#### MEDICARE PART D DOUGHNUT HOLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, nearly 3 years, ago I voted against Medicare part D, and after the leadership held the vote open for 3 hours, it did pass.

Since that day, part D has never failed to disappoint its supporters and its detractors.

First, we learned that part D would cost almost twice as much as Congress was originally told. Next came the confusing enrollment process. So many seniors had no place to turn.

In New York seniors had 46 plans to choose from. Seniors recruited their children and grandchildren and their Congress people to help them navigate the confusing on-line application process, but they had problems figuring out which plan was the right plan for them.

While hosting town hall meetings on part D last year, I encountered many seniors who were thinking about not even enrolling in a plan because the process was just too confusing.

Today, many seniors are locked into plans that offer too little or too much coverage. Part D's faults are compounded by the fact that seniors were locked into their plans for a year. But providers could drop certain drugs from their plans without consequences.

Finally, after months of confusion, seniors are finally getting some relief on prescription drugs. But not as much as they could be. Medicare still isn't allowed to negotiate prices with drug companies like the VA can. And seniors can't reimport drugs from Canada to reduce costs either.

But part D's biggest problem is about to emerge. Many seniors are about to discover the plan's doughnut hole.

Mr. Speaker, the doughnut hole most people didn't understand, but it is the gap in the coverage that part D enrollees face when they purchase \$2,250 worth of prescription drugs in a year. Once seniors hit the doughnut hole, they will have to pay for their next \$3,100 worth of prescription drugs. Only after paying that money will their coverage continue. The saddest part of the doughnut hole is that a great many of the seniors aren't even aware that it exists.

We thought, in my district anyhow, that it would be late August before people would start reaching the doughnut hole. Unfortunately, in my area, we are getting the phone calls now. And since Medicare isn't allowed to negotiate with drug companies, seniors will pay the usual inflated prices for their drugs while they struggle to come out of the doughnut hole.

So soon many seniors will be back in the same predicament they were before part D. Some will have to decide whether to pay their bills or purchase prescription drugs. Others will put their health at risk by reducing their dosage in order to afford their medication. And many will have to spend their way out of the doughnut hole every year for the rest of their life.

The doughnut hole isn't just the result of bad legislation, it is a threat to our public health. Seniors will take less drugs than they are prescribed to avoid falling into the doughnut hole.

Part D penalizes seniors who take a lot of medication. Seniors essentially

get fined over \$3,000 for buying prescription drugs they need. It is absolutely absurd.

It is time to fix part D. It is time for a prescription drug plan that puts the interests of our seniors and the disabled before the interests of big drug companies.

Mr. Speaker, let's start listening to the seniors who attend part D town hall meetings on Long Island and across the country, instead of drug lobbyists.

In the next few weeks, thousands of seniors will be getting an unexpected bill for more than \$3,000 for Medicare. Let's fix part D.

It is time for a simple, affordable and guaranteed prescription drug plan for our seniors. Part D has caused nothing but headaches for seniors since Day 1. And now it threatens to penalize them for taking their medication.

Mr. Speaker, it is a shame that we couldn't have worked bipartisanship, because I actually do think that we could have solved this problem by working together. Unfortunately, politics got in the way of policy.

I was hoping, as I held my seminars in my district, I did not come out and say anything negative. I said, I am here to help you get through it. It is the law of the land, and I will continue to do that. But to put our seniors through this is wrong.

We should come up with a better idea. We should fix Medicare. We should make it easier for our seniors.

---

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 250, CARL D. PERKINS CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2006

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-598) on the resolution (H. Res. 946) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 250) to amend the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998 to improve the Act, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

---

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5682, UNITED STATES AND INDIA NUCLEAR COOPERATION PROMOTION ACT OF 2006

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-599) on the resolution (H. Res. 947) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5682) to exempt from certain requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 a proposed nuclear agreement for cooperation with India, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### SUNSET COMMISSION LEGISLATION

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim my time out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor of the House again this Tuesday evening as part of the weekly Congressional Constitution Caucus efforts to highlight the Federal Government's limited powers as defined by the United States Constitution, specifically, the 10th amendment of our cherished Bill of Rights.

And I would also like to take this time to thank the gentlemen from Texas and Kansas for their efforts, the gentlemen, Mr. BRADY and Mr. TIAHRT, who have been leaders on the topic that I am going to discuss briefly, and that is the need for an independent body and procedures to review the merits of the many, many Federal programs that the American taxpayer has to pay for.

In light of our high taxes and even higher deficit, the time for increased efficiency couldn't be greater than today. The American worker is working harder than he should be, sending too much of his hard earned dollars down here to the Federal Government, only to see it wasted on layers and layers of redundancy and red tape and bureaucracy.

And so for that reason, I am here tonight to show my support for Mr. TIAHRT's H.R. 5766 and Mr. BRADY's H.R. 3282, which are going to be scheduled for a floor vote later this week on Thursday.

Due to these gentlemen's efforts, we have legislation they have drafted, they have set up a process of reviewing the effectiveness of Federal programs. It is a simple concept to make sure that the Federal Government is as efficient as it could be, in essence, to reduce the amount of time and energy that the American worker has to work, and the money that he has to send from his paycheck down here to Washington.

It is no secret that there are many Federal programs that are simply not serving the American public. There are programs that are duplicative, that are no longer necessary, that simply waste taxpayers dollars. The taxpayer currently works 192 days just to pay for his share of the Federal Government spending. That is just about a week ago they finished working that, and now you are working for yourself. So we are simply asking our constituents to put in a few less hours under these bills to help them to keep more of their money in the Federal budget.

It was Ronald Reagan once said that the closest thing to immortality that he would ever find here on earth is the Federal program. Well, we are trying to end that and make sure that some of